## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, as amended, remain herein.

Minor editorial changes for clarity have been made in claims 1-3.

- 1. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 3 has been amended to moot the rejection.

  Antecedent basis in claim 3 is now clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.
- 2. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Fu et al. U.S. Patent 5,703,965.

The presently claimed deblocking filter arithmetic apparatus includes first to eighth arithmetic blocks each for receiving, as inputs, simultaneously every two adjacent pixel data among a first to an eighth pixel data, for carrying out in parallel one of cycles of arithmetic processing comprising filter processing of first to eighth pixel data for removing block noises, every time two of the pixel data are input, and each for

outputting respective filtered pixel data in parallel and corresponding to the first to the eighth pixel data and to which two of the pixel data are input simultaneously. This arrangement and corresponding method for operating such arrangement are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Fu '965, column 21, lines 7-15 as allegedly disclosing applicants' receiving simultaneously every two data among first to eighth successive pixel data. Actually, Fu '965 discloses a circuit that receives eight pixel data and does not disclose receiving simultaneously every two data, or applicants' claimed processing of combinations of arithmetic blocks. In contrast, the presently claimed deblocking filter arithmetic apparatus operates so that every inputted two pixel data are subject to filtering processing respectively in eight arithmetic blocks as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 3.

For the foregoing reasons, Fu '965 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Fu '965 that would have suggested the

desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention.

Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-3 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-3 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

August 17, 2004

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: HYAE:119

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 Prince Street, Suite 210

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220